

A.2
4/22/96

Letter of Transmittal

BLACK & VEATCH Special Projects Corp.

101 North Wacker Drive, Suite 1100, Chicago, Illinois, 60606, Phone (312) 346-3775, Fax (312) 346-4781

To: Ms. Sheri Bianchin
United States Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard (HSRW-6J)
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Date: April 22, 1996
From: Matt Mastronardi
Project: American Chemical Services
Project No.: 71670
File: C.3

We are sending you: ☒ Attached ☐ Under separate cover via _____

☐ Preliminary Report

☐ Specifications

☐ Final Report

☐ Change Order

☒ Other: Dewatering/Barrier Wall Alignment
Review Comments

☐ Addendum

These items are transmitted:

☒ As requested

☐ For your information

☐ For your approval

☐ For review and comment

Remarks: The review comments (including a disk copy) for the Dewatering/Barrier Wall Alignment Report are included

Please call me with any questions.

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



464725

Copy To: Steve Mrkvicka, BVSPC

Signed:

Matt Mastronardi

April 22, 1996

Review Comments
Technical Memorandum
Dewatering/Barrier Wall Alignment Investigation Report - March 1996
American Chemical Services, Inc.

Page 4, 2nd bullet, 2nd sentence.

Remove this sentence, as it is irrelevant. The EPA oversight contractor is not authorized to approve or disapprove field decisions.

Page 8, 3rd paragraph.

Further discussion of the SB127 location is necessary. It appears that the PCB contamination is localized at SB127, and moving the alignment north is prohibited by the tanks. However, it may be possible to excavate and remove the contaminated soils during the installation of the barrier wall. Include a discussion of this scenario, including confirmational sampling.

Page 10, 4th paragraph.

Placement of the alignment just east of SB205 as suggested here, and indicated on figure 2, will exclude soils classified as waste (based on paragraph 3). If the alignment is to remain as proposed, removal action (with confirmational sampling) will be necessary to ensure that soils exceeding waste criteria are removed.

The 4th sentence states that moving the barrier wall outward is not a "viable solution", apparently because of the relatively thick layer of refuse encountered at SB205A. However, in the next paragraph, 5th sentence, excavation and backfilling are proposed in the SB201 and SB210 locations to address the problems associated with refuse and their effects on barrier wall constructability. Why isn't this alternative applicable to the SB205 and SB205A locations?

Review Comments
Technical Memorandum
Dewatering/Barrier Wall Alignment Investigation Report - March 1996
American Chemical Services, Inc.

Page 4, 2nd bullet, 2nd sentence.

Remove this sentence, as it is irrelevant. The EPA oversight contractor is not authorized to approve or disapprove field decisions.

Page 8, 3rd paragraph.

Further discussion of the SB127 location is necessary. It appears that the PCB contamination is localized at SB127, and moving the alignment north is prohibited by the tanks. However, it may be possible to excavate and remove the contaminated soils during the installation of the barrier wall. Include a discussion of this scenario, including confirmational sampling.

Page 10, 4th paragraph.

Placement of the alignment just east of SB205 as suggested here, and indicated on figure 2, will exclude soils classified as waste (based on paragraph 3). If the alignment is to remain as proposed, removal action (with confirmational sampling) will be necessary to ensure that soils exceeding waste criteria are removed.

The 4th sentence states that moving the barrier wall outward is not a "viable solution", apparently because of the relatively thick layer of refuse encountered at SB205A. However, in the next paragraph, 5th sentence, excavation and backfilling are proposed in the SB201 and SB210 locations to address the problems associated with refuse and their effects on barrier wall constructability. Why isn't this alternative applicable to the SB205 and SB205A locations?